



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,365	08/22/2003	Martin A. Dorey	2337/107	8639

2101 7590 04/03/2006

BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP  
125 SUMMER STREET  
BOSTON, MA 02110-1618

EXAMINER

KIM, HAROLD J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2181

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/646,365

Applicant(s)

DOREY, MARTIN A.

Examiner

Harold Kim

Art Unit

2181

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

*Fritz M. Fleming*  
FRITZ FLEMING  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2100

*Supervisory*

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

*AU2181 3/29/2006*

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the filing of the Amendment, on 10/3/2005, has been considered but they are not persuasive. Accordingly, this action is made **FINAL**.

2. Claims 1-33 are presented for examination.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hitz et al., US Patent no. 6,457,130.**

5. In re claim 1, Hitz et al. shows a method for managing file security attributes [fig 1; col 4, lines 12-48] by a file server [110, fig 1] in a computer file storage system [fig 1], the computer file storage system including a file secured using a first file security model [fig 1], the method comprising:

receiving a first request [col 3, line 45; col 5, line 36] from a client [120, fig 1] relating to the file [112, fig 1] stored in the computer file storage system, the client utilizing a second file security model [NT, 120, fig 1];

retrieving a first set of file security attributes, in accordance with the first file security model, associated with the file [col 4, lines 12-29], the first set of file security

Art Unit: 2182

attributes including at least an owner identifier [UID, col 4, line 16] and a group identifier [GID, col 4, line 17]; and

generating a second set of file security attributes [col 6, lines 1-10], in accordance with the second file security model, from the set of file security attributes, the second set of file security attributes including a plurality of security identifiers (SID) [col 4, lines 46-47] including at least an owner SID [col 4, line 46] derived from the owner identifier and a group SID [col 4, line 47] derived from the UNIX group identifier, wherein at least one of the owner SID and the group SID includes at least one map failure indicator and the corresponding identifier ["If there is no such translation for the Unix user name, the file server 110 uses the Unix user name, without translation, as the NT user name", col 6, lines 42-48] from the first set of file security attributes, wherein the map failure indicator indicates that said identifier relates to the first file security model.

6. In re claim 2, Hitz et al. shows the at least one map failure indicator includes an authority identifier, specific to the first file security model, and an owner/group indicator having a first value to indicate that the identifier is the owner identifier from the first set of security attributes [col 6, lines 42-48], and a second value to indicate that the identifier is the group identifier from the first set of security attributes [col 6, lines 42-48].

7. In re claim 3, Hitz et al. shows the at least one map failure indicator includes an authority identifier, specific to the first file security model, having a first value to indicate that the identifier is the owner identifier from the first set of file security attributes and a

Art Unit: 2182

second value to indicate that the identifier is the group identifier from the first set of file security attributes [col 6, lines 42-48].

8. In re claim 4, Hitz et al. shows generating the second set of file security attributes [col 6, lines 25-52] from the first set of file security attributes comprises:

attempting to map each identifier from the first set of file security attributes to a corresponding identifier from the second set of file security attributes [col 6, lines 25-52; col 7, lines 53-54]; and

generating, for each identifier from the first set of file security attributes that cannot be mapped to a corresponding identifier from the second set of file security attributes, the SID including the at least one map failure indicator and the corresponding identifier from the first set of file security attributes [col 6, lines 46-48; col 7, lines 60-64].

9. In re claim 5, Hitz et al. shows attempting to map each identifier from the first set of file security attributes to a corresponding identifier from the second set of file security attributes comprises:

maintaining a table mapping a first set of names in accordance with the first file security model to a second set of names in accordance with the second file security model [col 6, lines 25-52];

determining a name from the first set of names corresponding to the identifier from the first set of file security attributes [col 6, lines 25-52; col 8, lines 7-10]; and

searching the table for a name from the second set of names corresponding to the name from the first set of names [col 6, lines 25-52].

Art Unit: 2182

10. In re claim 6, Hitz et al. shows determining a name from the first set of names corresponding to the identifier from the first set of file security attributes comprises [col 6, lines 25-52]:

maintaining a cache mapping [col 6, lines 62-63] identifiers from the first set of file security attributes to names in the first set of names; and

searching the cache for a name from the first set of names corresponding to the identifier from the first set of file security attributes [col 6, lines 62-63].

11. In re claim 7, Hitz et al. shows sending the identifier from the first set of file security attributes over a communication link to a NIS server [col 7, line 59]; and receiving the name from the first set of names over the communication link from the NIS server [col 7, line 59].

12. In re claim 8, Hitz et al. shows transmitting the second set of file security attributes to the client in a response to the first request [col 5, lines 51-55].

13. In re claim 9, Hitz et al. shows receiving a second request from the client utilizing the second file security model including at least one of said SIDs including at least one map failure indicator and the corresponding identifier from the first set of file security attributes [col 6, lines 49-52];

translating the at least one of said SIDs into a text string [col 6, lines 43-44]; and

translating the text string to the client in a response to the second request [col 6, lines 43-44].

14. In re claim 10, Hitz et al. shows the text string includes a representation of the identifier from the SID [col 6, lines 43-44].

15. In re claim 11, Hitz et al. shows a first set of file permissions, in accordance with the first file security model [col 6, lines 16-48], and wherein generating the second set of file security attributes from the first set of file security attributes further comprises:

generating a second set of file permissions, in accordance with the second file security model, from the first set of file permissions [col 6, lines 16-48].

16. In re claim 12, Hitz et al. shows at least one requested change to the security attributes of the file [col 8, line 11], and wherein the method further comprises:

applying the requested security attribute changes to the second set of file security attributes to create a modified set of file security attributes in accordance with the second file security model [col 8, lines 35-46]; and

writing the modified set of file security attributes to the file [col 8, lines 35-46], said writing effectively changing the security model of the file from the first file security model to the second file security model [col 8, lines 35-46].

17. In re claims 13-14, Hitz et al. shows a session having a session owner and session group [col 4, lines 63, 46-47].

18. In re claim 15, Hitz et al. shows translating the first set of file permissions into a second set of file permissions, the second set of file permissions defining owner permissions, group permissions, and everybody permissions [col 10, lines 1-17].



Art Unit: 2182

19. In re claim 16, Hitz et al. shows an apparatus for managing file security attributes in a computer file storage system [fig 1], the computer file storage system including a file secured using a first file security model, the file associated with a first set of file security attributes including an owner identifier and a group identifier [col 4, lines 8-42], the apparatus comprising:

a network interface [120, fig 1] for communicating with clients over a communication network [fig 1];

a storage interface [110, fig 1] for communicating with a file storage device [111];  
and

file security logic [CIFS, NFS, fig 1] operating between the network interface and the storage interface for managing file security attributes, the file security logic including logic for generating a second set of file security attributes, in accordance with a second file security model [col 6, lines 1-10], from the first set of file security attributes, the second set of file security attributes including at least an owner SID derived from the owner identifier and a group SID derived from the group identifier [col 4, lines 12-54; col 6, lines 25-52], wherein at least one of the owner SID and the group SID includes at least one map failure indicator and the corresponding identifier from the first set of file security attributes, wherein the map failure indicator indicates that said identifier relates to the first file security model [col 6, lines 45-48].

20. In re claim 29, Hitz et al. shows an apparatus for managing file security attributes [fig 1; col 4, lines 12-48] in a computer file storage system [fig 1], the apparatus comprising:



means for translating an owner identifier in accordance with a first file security model into an owner SID, compatible with a second file security model [col 6, lines 25-30; col 4, lines 12-56];

means for translating a group identifier in accordance with a first file security model into a group SID, compatible with the second file security model [col 6, lines 25-30; col 4, lines 12-56]; and

means for translating file access permissions, in accordance with a first file security model, into an access control list, compatible with the second file security model [col 6, lines 25-30; col 4, lines 12-56].

21. Claims 17-28 and 30-33 are rejected under the same rationale as discussed above in claims 1-16 and 29.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, applicants argued in substance that (1) Hitz does not show when the system is unable to map a Unix name to a Windows name, the system returns the Unix ID along with a Unix-specific indicator.

Examiner respectfully traverses applicants' remarks.

As to point (1), Unix ID along with a Unix-specific indicator are not found in the amended claims. Claimed subject matter, not the specification, is the measure of invention. Limitations in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art. In re Self, 213 USPQ 1,5 (CCPA 1982); In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11,15 (CCPA 1978).

In addition, Hitz does show map failure indicator and the corresponding identifier from the first set of file security attributes, wherein the map failure indicator indicates that said identifier relates to the first file security model. Hitz stated "The file server 110 translates the Unix user name into an NT user name using a selected mapping file. ... If there is no such translation for the Unix user name, the file server 110 uses the Unix user name, without translation, as the NT user name" in col 6, lines 42-48. The Unix user name, without translation, as the NT user name serves as the map failure indicator and the corresponding identifier.

### ***Conclusion***

This Office Action is in response to the filing of the Amendment, on 10/3/2005, has been considered but they are not persuasive. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2182

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop \_\_\_\_\_  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

The centralized fax number is 571-273-8300.

The centralized hand carry paper drop off location is:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Customer Service Window, Mail Stop \_\_\_\_\_  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the central telephone number (571) 272-2100.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harold Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-4148. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fritz Fleming can be reached on 571-272-4145. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2182

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Harold J. Kim  
Patent Examiner  
March 28, 2006/HK

  
Supervisory **FRITZ FLEMING**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**GROUP 2100**  
Au2181 3/29/2006